

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Marcus Antonio Thompson,

Petitioner,

v.

Robert M. Stevenson, III,

Respondent.

C.A. No.: 4:11-1748-TMC

ORDER

This matter is before the court on the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Dkt. #29). The *pro se* Petitioner, an inmate currently incarcerated at the Broad River Correctional Institution, filed this action seeking relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, filed on February 13, 2012, recommends that the Petition be dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute. (Dkt. # 29). The Report and Recommendation sets forth in detail the relevant facts and legal standards on this matter, and the court incorporates the Magistrate Judge's recommendation herein without a recitation.

The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific

objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge's recommendation or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report and Recommendation results in a party's waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

On February 13, 2012, the Magistrate Judge filed the Report and Recommendation, and a copy of it was placed in the mail to Petitioner. (Dkt. # 29). Petitioner was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. # 29-1). However, Petitioner has not objected to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation that the Petition be dismissed. Based on the foregoing, it appears the Petitioner no longer wishes to pursue this action.

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Dkt. # 29) and incorporates it herein. Accordingly, the Petition is **DISMISSED** with prejudice for failure to prosecute pursuant to Rule

41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the factors outlined in *Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez*, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir.1982). See *Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
March 8, 2012

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.